



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

p. 102), and 51, lines 8 and 19; also in 244, 'the witness is in the gods of Ma'an.'

The illumination of these terms throws light upon the legal processes of the South-Arabs. A law was published in stone and also attested by witnesses in their 'books' (of palm-leaves?). One thinks involuntarily of the episode in Isaiah 8. 1-2, which may have been an imitation of public usage.

P. S. Since writing the above I note בָּאָמֵר וַעֲחַפֵּת CIS 314. 8, which Halévy (*R. Sém.* 4 (1896), p. 83 ff.) correctly translates *verbo et scripto*, rejected by the editor Derenbourg. The passage has to do with written orders, which are dated, from the kings concerning the presentation of certain votive offerings. In line 9 I would interpret לְצַחַף gerundively, *scribendo*.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

University of Pennsylvania

וּ as an Old Plural Ending of the Hebrew Noun

The וּ, *û*, as a plural ending is recognized in Hebrew in the verb only. But the Arabic, the Assyrian of the First Dynasty age, as well as the Old Egyptian (cf. Erman, *Äg. Gr.* § 189) use it also as a plural ending in the noun.

But traces of the old *û* in stat. constr. are still found in some passages of the Bible. It is in the first place found in the Ketib, which very often preserves older forms, but sometimes the old plural ending is preserved even without being modified by the Qere. Its true character as a plural ending can then be recognized either by the context of the passage in question, or by the testimony of the old versions.

The following are the passages in which the *û* as a plural ending has been preserved in the Ketib only: Jos. 6. 9: תְּקֻעַו הַשׁוֹפְרוֹת, Qere: תְּקֻעֵי; Is. 47. 13: שָׁמִים, Qere: שָׁמָיִם; Ps. 119. 79: יְרָאֵד וַיְרָעֵו עֲרָתִיךְ, Qere: יְרָאֵד; 1 Chr. 2.55: הַבָּרִי, Qere: הַבָּרִי; יְשַׁבּוּ עַבְּדֵי, Qere: יְשַׁבּוּ עַבְּדֵי¹.

The plural ending *û* is employed not only in the nominative, but also in the genitive and the accusative. Just as the plural

¹ Here perhaps belongs also 1 Chr. 6. 11: בְּנֵי בְּנֵו אֶלְקָנָה, Qere: בְּנֵי בְּנֵו.

ending *îm*, (ê), originally used for the genitive and accusative, has supplanted the original nominative ending *ûn*, (û), so also the û is found as plural ending in the genitive: 2 Kings 17. 13: בַּיִדּוּ נְבִיאִים: Qere: and in the accusative: Hos. 8. 12: רַבְּיִם: Qere: אֲכַתּוּ לְרַבְּוֹתָהּ It occurs also in the part. pass. 2 Sam. 5. 8: שְׁנָאוּ נְפָשׁוֹת: Qere: and in the dual, Eze. 1. 8: יְרָדוּ אֲדָמָה: Qere: יְרָדוּ אֲדָמָה: Qere:

There are also passages in which, as already mentioned, the plural ending û in the construct state is not indicated as such owing to its being changed in the Qere to the regular plural constr. ending ê. In such cases we have to look for other evidence to prove its plural character:—

פְּנִים Gen. 32. 32: פְּנִיאָל = *ibid.* 31 from the plural (1 Chr. 8. 25: פְּנִיאָל, Qere: Lev. 6. 3: מְדוֹנָר, Onq. and Jon. render it as לְבֹשִׁין ^{רְבִיזָן}: Perhaps also in 2 Sam. 20. 8: מְדִי = מְדוֹן. וַיֹּאֶבְחַנּוּ מְדוֹן לְבָשָׂו: Jer. 31. 24: אֲכָרִים וְנִסְעָו בְּעָדָר: Aq. Sym. Jon. and Vulg. render תְּעֻוּ בְּמִדְבָּר: וְנִסְעָי = Ps. 107. 4: The parallels of verse 10, יְזַרְּדִי הַיִם, and 23, יְשַׁבְּיִ חַשְׁךּ, make it probable that תְּעֻנּוּ is also a participle = תְּעֻנָּה (which reading has already been proposed; cf. Kittel ad. loc.).⁵

A plural ending û was already recognized by S. D. Luzzatto

כל נְבִיא וּכְלָחֶזֶה.
² Targ. Jonathan, ed. Lagarde, and the Syriac version read:

³ The endings of the casus have frequently been disregarded, cf. e. g. Tuch, 'Sinaitische Inschriften,' *ZDMG* 3 (1849), p. 138: 'Rücksichtlich des Plurals lässt der Status constr. (Beer 133 ff.) = **بَنِي** nur soviel erkennen, dass man **بَنِي** u. **بَنُو** dem casus nach nicht unterschied.'

⁴ The Samaritan reads: **רְבִיזָן**.—To Onqelos cf. Nachmanides ad. loc. who thinks that Onq. considered כָּדוֹ as a collective; but then we would expect לְבֹשָׁהִי.

⁵ שְׁבַע בְּצָלָי of the LXX of Eze. 31. 17, as of Ps. 76. 7: (so נְרַדְמוּ רְבַבִּי כָּסֶם as נְרַדְמוּ רְכַבִּי וּסְסָם also the Syriac version) in which case we shall have only the transposition of the 1 and 2 and the rendering of the Syriac version of Ps. 97. 10: שְׁנָאוּ רָע as شְׁנָאוּ as also a few MSS.).

in the much discussed Jer. 15. 10. In a letter dated December 9, 1836, he writes:

“כלה מקלוני, נראה לי לקרוא מקלוני, מקללים אותן, כמו בתלמוד ירושלמי (דמאי פ' 2) דאין מחשדונך “שהוא כמו מחשדין יתך.”

In the Aramaic parts of the Talmud \hat{u} as plural ending of the participle occurs very often, cf. Margolis, *Lehrb. d. Aram. Spr. d. Talmuds*, p. 40 ff. Margolis, it is true, considers it as a later form developed by analogy of the perf., but may we not assume that it represents the old plural ending \hat{u} ?

M. SEIDEL

Baltimore, Md.

Burkhan

With reference to my note on the word *Burkhan* (in the JOURNAL, 36. 390—395) I now note that R. Gauthiot (*Mélanges Sylvain Lévi*, Paris, 1911, p. 112) had already opposed the theory of Baron A. von Staël-Holstein of Petrograd. Gauthiot regarded that etymology as ‘very doubtful,’ and remarked (in the same manner as I did) that compounds of this kind do not exist in Turkish. Moreover, he justly emphasized that the historical facts run counter to such a conception of the term, and that the history of the expansion of Buddhism in the Iranian regions toward the northwest of India and the fluctuations of Chinese influence in Central Asia render that theory rather improbable. While regretting that I overlooked Gauthiot’s comment, I am glad to find myself in full accord with the opinion of that eminent philologist, whose premature death we have every reason to deplore.

In regard to the Manchu term *Fučihi*, Professor P. Schmidt, now president of the Oriental Institute of Vladivostok, has been good enough to write me that he regards *-i-hi* as a suffix added to

מערבי שידל⁶. So also Steinberg in his Hebrew Grammar p. 361. But in his lexicon he suggests to read פְּלִיחָם מִשְׁפְּטֵי הָאָרֹרִים לְשֵׁון עֲבָרִי (Baer reads פְּלִיחָם but we would rather expect the imperfect instead of the perfect, cf. also Kittel *ad loc.*—The use of the participle with the plural ending \hat{u} when combined with a suffix occurs also in the *פִּיטָּה* for Shebu’oth: המלבישים אותן=הפליבישוק לבוש עדרנים.